

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Gregory Eugene Wilson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Christine Wormuth, Secretary Department of  
the Army; Mrs. Nichele Johnson, Training  
Instructor Supervisor; Attorney General of the  
U.S., Department of Justice; and United States  
Attorney for District of South Carolina,

Defendants.

C/A: 3:23-cv-419-SAL

**ORDER**


Plaintiff Gregory Eugene Wilson, proceeding pro se, sues his former federal employer, alleging he was wrongfully terminated and was retaliated against in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.* Pending before the court are a motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Christine Wormuth and Nichelle Johnson, ECF No. 24; a motion for default judgment by Plaintiff, ECF No. 25; and a motion for summary judgment by Plaintiff, ECF No. 32. The motions have all been addressed in a Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). [ECF No. 38.] The magistrate judge recommends denying Plaintiff’s motions, granting Defendants’ motion, and dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint with prejudice. *Id.* at 17. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. *Id.* at 18. Plaintiff has not filed objections, and the time for doing so has expired.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After reviewing the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 38, and incorporates the Report by reference herein. As a result, Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment, ECF No. 25, and motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 32, are **DENIED**; Defendants’ motion to dismiss, ECF No. 24, is **GRANTED**. And this matter is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

November 13, 2023  
Columbia, South Carolina

  
Sherri A. Lydon  
United States District Judge